

Welfare Reform Working Group
Talking Points: **RESPONSE TO CHARLES MURRAY**
May 3, 1994

"He did the country a great service. I mean, he and I have often disagreed, but I think his analysis is essentially right. Now, whether his prescription is right, I question...I once polled 100 children in an alternative school in Atlanta--many of whom had had babies out of wedlock--and I said, 'If we didn't give any AFDC to people after they had their first child, how many of you think it would reduce the number of out-of-wedlock births?' Over 80 percent of the kids raised their hands. There's no question that that would work. But the question is...Is it morally right?"

"...There is no question that...if we reduced Aid to Families with Dependent Children, it would be some incentive for people not to have dependent children out of wedlock...[O]nce a really poor woman has a child out of wedlock, it almost locks her and that child into the cycle of poverty which then spins out of control further."

President Clinton, NBC News interview 12/3/93

Teen pregnancy, illegitimacy, and single-parent families are important problems which must be addressed. We agree that violence, crime, drug use, poverty, and homelessness are in part linked to the breakdown of families.

However, holding teenage parents responsible for support of their children makes more sense than simply cutting off benefits. Our approach would condition teenage mothers' AFDC benefits on staying in school, living at home with their parents or a responsible adult, identifying their child's father, participating in job training, and attending parenting classes. This combination of "carrots and sticks" is only possible if you continue benefits for single mothers who take steps toward self-sufficiency--and reduce benefits for those who don't.

Simply cutting off support to teenagers and their young children is irresponsible, dangerous, and potentially counterproductive. In a recent poll, an overwhelming 70 percent of Americans rejected this approach.¹ While Murray says his approach will not harm children, the truth is that millions of young mothers and children would no longer have a safety net of any sort. This untried approach would almost certainly increase crime and homelessness. The President's strategy of time-limited benefits and supportive services would, like Murray's, end welfare as a way of life--but would preserve it as a "second chance."

It's important to demand responsibility of teenage fathers as well as teenage mothers. One of the worst features of Charles Murray's approach is that it lets teenage fathers off the hook. True welfare reform demands that both parents take

¹L.A. Times poll of 1,682 adults in April 1994. The margin was +/- 3%. Asked if they would support "no benefits" for women with children born out of wedlock, 70% said no and 26% said yes.

responsibility for their children, and we believe no plan will succeed without a commitment to paternity establishment and tougher child support enforcement.² Our proposal requires mothers to provide paternity and locating information before receiving benefits. We will also develop hospital-based programs to determine paternity for all babies, since studies have shown such proactive efforts to be most successful.

Conditional AFDC benefits work. A rigorous evaluation of one such program in Illinois and New Jersey found that teenage mothers who received conditional benefits, along with case management and support services, achieved significantly higher rates of school attendance and employment. The 3,000 participants who faced a \$160 reduction in their monthly AFDC grants had success rates nearly 20 percent higher than young mothers who did not face sanctions or receive services. Simply "writing off" an entire generation of young people would do nothing to build job skills and turn dependence into independence.

²"I am letting unmarried fathers off the hook...Given that a woman chooses to engage in sex knowing that the man is not wearing a condom, what is the responsibility of a male for the fact that a child is conceived and carried to term in an age when contraceptives and abortion are freely available?...As far as I can tell, he has approximately the same casual responsibility as a slice of chocolate cake has in determining whether a woman gains weight." Charles Murray, The Sunday Times 11/14/93

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT BILL CLINTON

The only way to get a real job with a growing income is to have real skills and the ability to learn new ones. We simply must streamline today's patchwork of training programs and make them a source of new skills for people who lose their jobs. Reemployment, not unemployment, will be the centerpiece of our program for economic renewal, and I urge you to pass it this year.

Just as we must transform our unemployment system, we must also revolutionize our welfare system. It doesn't work. It defies our values as a nation.

If we value work, we cannot justify a system that makes welfare more attractive than work.

If we value personal responsibility, we cannot ignore the \$34 billion in child support that absent parents ought to be paying to millions of mothers and children.

If we value strong families, we cannot perpetuate a system that penalizes those who stay together. Can you believe that a child who has a child gets more money from the government for leaving home than for staying with a parent or a grandparent?

That's not just bad policy, it is wrong. And we must change it.

I worked for years on this welfare problem, and I can tell you: the people who most want to change welfare are the very people on it. They want to get off welfare, and get back to work, and support their children.

Last year, we began. We gave the states more power to innovate -- because we know that great ideas can come from outside Washington -- and many states are using it.

Then, we took a dramatic step. Instead of taxing people with modest incomes who are working their way out of poverty, we dramatically increased the Earned Income Tax Credit to lift them out of poverty, to reward work over welfare, to make it possible for people to be successful workers and successful parents.

But there is more to be done.

- MORE -

This spring, I will send you comprehensive welfare reform legislation that builds on the Family Support Act and restores the basic values of work and responsibility.

We will say to teenagers, "If you have a child out of wedlock, we will no longer give a check to set up a separate household. We want families to stay together."

To absent parents who aren't paying their child support, we'll say, "If you're not providing for your children, we'll garnish your wages, we'll suspend your license, we'll track you across state lines, and if necessary, we'll make some of you work off what you owe. People who bring children into this world can't just walk away."

And to all those who depend on welfare, we should offer this simple compact: We will provide the support, the job training, the child care you need for up to two years. But after that, anyone who can work must work -- in the private sector, if possible, in community service, if necessary. We will make welfare what it ought to be: A second chance, not a way of life.

We must tackle welfare reform in 1994, yes, as we tackle health care. A million people are on welfare today are there because it's the only way they can get health care coverage. Those who choose to leave welfare for jobs without health benefits find themselves in the incredible position of paying taxes that help pay for health coverage for those who choose to stay on welfare. No wonder many people leave work and go back on welfare to get health care coverage. We must solve the health care problem to solve the welfare problem.

HHS FACT SHEET

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

January 1994

Contact: ACF Press Office
(202) 401-9215

FACTS RELATED TO WELFARE REFORM Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC)

Benefits

- AFDC benefit levels range from \$120 per month for a family of three in Mississippi to \$923 per month in Alaska, with the median state paying \$367 in AFDC benefits (January 1993 figures). Food stamp benefits fall as AFDC benefits increase, however, offsetting to some degree the disparity in AFDC benefit levels among the different states.
- AFDC benefit levels have declined by 42 percent in the last two decades. The average monthly benefit for a mother and two children with no earnings has shrunk in constant 1992 dollars from \$690 in 1972 to \$399 in 1992, a 42-percent decline.
- This decline has been partly offset by an increase in food stamp benefits, such that the combination of AFDC and food stamps for a mother and two children with no earnings has declined by 26 percent between 1972 and 1992.
- In all 50 states, AFDC benefits are below the Census Bureau's poverty threshold, varying from 13 percent of the threshold in Mississippi to 79 percent in Alaska (median of 39 percent).

Caseloads

- The number of persons receiving AFDC each year has increased significantly between 1975 and 1992. In 1975, 11.1 million individuals received benefits, and in 1992, 13.6 million persons received AFDC (up from 12.6 in 1991). Over the same time period, the average size of AFDC families has fallen, from 3.2 persons in 1975 to 2.9 persons in 1992.
- Reciprocity rates, defined as the total number of AFDC recipients divided by the State population, have not followed a uniform trend among all States. While rates in some States increased substantially between 1975 and 1992, 22 States experienced a decline in monthly reciprocity rates over that time period.
- Two thirds of AFDC recipients are children. In 1992, AFDC provided benefits to 9.2 million children.

Expenditures

2

- Despite the increase in the number of recipients over the time period, benefit expenditures have remained relatively constant in real terms between 1975 (\$21.3 billion) and 1992 (\$22.2 billion). Real spending on AFDC apart from AFDC-UP has actually fallen since 1975, from \$20.3 billion in 1975 to \$20.1 billion in 1992.
- Contrary to the general conception, not all States have experienced an increase in total AFDC expenditures. While the national average between 1985 and 1992 was a 17-percent increase, State-by-State figures varied from an increase of 184 percent in Arizona to a decrease of 38 percent in Wisconsin.
- The share of Federal spending devoted to AFDC has declined from 1.5 percent in 1975 to 1.1 percent in 1992.

Recipient Characteristics

- Thirty-four percent of AFDC recipients in 1992 were white, 39 percent were Black and 19 percent Hispanic, as compared to 1973, when 38 percent of AFDC recipients were white, 45.8 percent Black and 13.4 percent Hispanic.
- Only 22 percent of AFDC families reported any non-AFDC income in 1992.
- Forty percent of female welfare recipients gave birth to their first child before the age of 19. Just over half had a high school degree when they entered the AFDC program, and 49 percent had not worked in the 12 months prior to entry.

The JOBS Program

- Overall 16 percent of adult non-exempt AFDC recipients nationwide were enrolled in the JOBS program in 1992. Only Indiana, Maine, Maryland and Guam failed to reach the 11 percent participation rate mandated in the Family Support Act for fiscal year 1992.
- Fiscal year 1992 Federal funding for the JOBS program was capped at \$1 billion. However, State spending was only sufficient to draw down two-thirds of the available Federal funding for fiscal year 1992, and only 11 States claimed their full allocation of Federal funds. Only 19 States intended to spend enough to claim their full allocation in fiscal year 1993.

Other Facts

Living Arrangements of Children

- While the total child population in the United States was approximately the same in 1960 as in 1991, the percent of children living with a single parent increased from 9 percent to 26 percent. The majority of children born today will spend some time in a single-parent family.

Labor Force Participation of Women

- The percent of women who work in the wage labor market has increased dramatically in recent decades. Between 1950 and 1992, the labor force participation of women with children under age 6 increased from 14 percent to 58 percent.

Child Poverty

- In 1992, 22 percent of children lived in poverty. Among children in female-headed families, the rate was 54 percent; among children in families with a male present, the rate was 11 percent.

Child Support Enforcement

- In families with children with an absent father in 1989, 58 percent had a child support order in place, 37 percent received some payment, and 26 percent received the full payment.

###

HHS FACT SHEET

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

April 1994

STATE WELFARE DEMONSTRATIONS

Under section 1115 of the Social Security Act, HHS is authorized to grant states waivers of current laws governing the AFDC and Medicaid programs. This authority is intended to give states the flexibility to demonstrate alternatives that better match their residents' needs.

HHS is committed to fulfilling President Clinton's mandate to make the waiver process more efficient. This should give states more flexibility in their management of joint federal-state programs while maintaining quality services for HHS beneficiaries.

Since January 1993, HHS has approved welfare demonstration projects in Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Iowa, North Dakota, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Vermont, Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming.

ARKANSAS:

Under Arkansas' demonstration, AFDC parents age 16 or younger will be required to attend school regularly or face reductions in benefits if they fail to do so. If appropriate, teenage parents can meet the requirement by attending an alternative educational program.

In addition, Arkansas will implement a policy of not increasing AFDC benefits when additional children are born into a family receiving welfare. Family planning and group counseling services focusing on the responsibilities of parenthood will be included in the demonstration.

Arkansas' application was received on January 14, 1993 and approved on March 5, 1994.

CALIFORNIA:

California's demonstration will encourage teen-age AFDC parents to regularly attend school by paying them a \$100 cash bonus for maintaining a C average, and \$500 for ultimately graduating from high school. Teen-age parents who fail to maintain a D average can have their AFDC payments reduced by up to \$50 a month for two months.

The demonstration will also permit AFDC families to accumulate \$2,000 in assets and have \$4,500 equity in a car. In addition, families will be able to deposit \$5,000 into savings so long as the funds are used to purchase a home, start a business or finance a child's post-secondary education or training.

Finally, the demonstration will allow recipients who work -- but who have low AFDC benefits -- to opt out of the program. They will remain eligible for health care under Medi-Cal as well as other services, such as child care, which are available to AFDC recipients.

California's waiver request was received on Sept. 29, 1993, and granted Feb. 28, 1994.

COLORADO:

Colorado is initiating a "Personal Responsibility and Employment Program" which includes a number of major revisions to the state's AFDC program. The demonstration will operate in five counties. Under the demonstration, parents who are able to work or able to participate in a training program must do so after receiving AFDC benefits for two years. Individuals who refuse to perform the assignments can face a loss of AFDC benefits.

Additionally, the demonstration will "cash out" Food Stamps for participants, meaning that the value of the coupons will be added to the monthly AFDC payment. Participants will be encouraged to work through a new formula which will enable families to keep more of the money they earn. Asset levels and rules pertaining to ownership of an automobile will also be changed so that participants will be permitted to own a car regardless of its value or their equity in it.

Finally, the demonstration provides for payment of financial bonuses when participants stay in school and graduate from a secondary (high school) or GED program, and permits financial penalties to be assessed when parents fail to have their children immunized. Colorado's waiver request was received on June 30, 1993, and granted on Jan. 15, 1994.

FLORIDA:

Florida is implementing a "Family Transition Program" for AFDC recipients in two counties. Under the plan, most AFDC families will be limited to collecting benefits for a maximum of 24 months in any five-year period.

Individuals who exhaust their transitional AFDC benefits but are unable to find employment will be guaranteed the opportunity to work at a job paying more than their AFDC grant. The demonstration also provides a longer period of eligibility -- 36 months in any six-year period -- for families who are at a high-risk of becoming welfare dependent.

Medicaid and child care benefits will be available in the demonstration. Local community boards will play a large role in overseeing the program.

Other elements of the demonstration include an increase in the earnings disregard formula and asset ceilings, as well as a statewide requirement that AFDC parents must ensure that their children have been immunized. Florida's waiver request was received on Sept. 21, 1993, and granted on Jan. 27, 1994.

GEORGIA:

Georgia is initiating the "Personal Accountability and Responsibility Project" (PAR) which strengthens federal work requirements that must be met in order to receive cash benefits. Georgia's welfare agency will now be able to exclude from an AFDC grant any able-bodied recipient between the age of 18 to 60 who has no children under the age of 14 and who willfully refuses to work or who leaves employment without good cause. The rest of the family will continue to be eligible for AFDC benefits.

The plan will also allow the state to deny additional cash benefits for additional children born after a family has been on welfare for at least two years if the child was conceived while the family was on welfare. However, PAR would allow recipients to 'learn back' the denied benefits through the receipt of child support payments or earnings.

Medicaid and Food Stamps eligibility will continue for all family members. In addition, Georgia will offer family planning services and instruction in parental skills to AFDC recipients. Georgia's waiver request was received on May 18, 1993, and granted on Nov. 2, 1993.

ILLINOIS:

The Work Pays component, added to the previously approved Project Fresh Start, encourages employment and thereby self-sufficiency by enabling recipients to keep more of their earnings than is normally allowed. The State will disregard two of each three dollars earned for as long as they continue working. Illinois' waiver request was received Aug. 2, 1993, and granted on Nov. 23, 1993.

IOWA:

Iowa is implementing a reform plan that will encourage AFDC and Food Stamp recipients to take jobs and accumulate assets through a program of "Individual Development Accounts." Funds deposited in an account can only be withdrawn to pay for education, training, home ownership, business start-up or family emergencies. The current law which limits each family's assets to \$1,000 will be changed to allow each applicant to have up to \$2,000 in assets and each AFDC family to possess up to \$5,000 in assets. Additionally, the vehicle asset ceiling will rise from \$1,500 to \$3,000.

Recipients will also be encouraged to work under a new formula which disregards 50 percent of their earnings in the calculation of benefits. For recipients lacking in significant work histories, all income will be disregarded during the first four months on AFDC. A Family Investment Program will be created for most AFDC parents, requiring them to participate in training and support services as a condition of AFDC receipt. Only parents with a child under 6 months old at home, those working at least 30 hours per week, and the disabled are exempt. Individuals who choose not to participate in the Family Investment Agreement will have their AFDC benefits phased out over six months and will not be able to reapply for another six months. Iowa's request was received Apr. 29, 1993, and granted Aug. 13, 1993.

NORTH DAKOTA:

North Dakota's demonstration will provide federal AFDC matching funds to the state for low-income women during the initial six months of pregnancy with their first child. Such payments are usually not available until the last trimester of the pregnancy.

In addition, the demonstration links AFDC to a requirement that individuals enroll in the state's welfare-to-work program and pursue education or training activities both during the first six months of pregnancy and after their child is three months of age.

North Dakota's waiver application was received on August 19, 1993, and approved on April 12, 1994.

OKLAHOMA:

Oklahoma's demonstration seeks to encourage welfare recipients to regularly attend school and ultimately graduate from a high school or equivalent educational program.

The demonstration provides that AFDC recipients between the ages of 13 and 18 need to remain in school or face a reduction in benefits if they drop out. The plan applies to teenage parents as well as children. Oklahoma's request was received Dec. 28, 1992, and granted Jan. 25, 1993.

SOUTH DAKOTA

South Dakota is initiating its "Strengthening of South Dakota Families Initiative" that encourages welfare recipients to undertake either employment or education activities. The program assigns AFDC participants to either an employment or education track that enables them to move from dependency to self-sufficiency. Individuals enrolled in the employment track will receive up to 24 months of AFDC benefits; those participating in the education track will receive up to 60 months of AFDC benefits.

Upon completion of either track, participants will be expected to find employment, or failing that, will be enrolled in approved community service activities. Individuals who refuse to perform the required community service without good cause will have their benefits reduced until they comply.

In addition, in conformance with the food stamp program, AFDC benefits can be denied to any family in which an adult parent quits a job without good cause. The sanction period will last three months, or until the parent acquires a comparable job.

The demonstration also enacts new rules pertaining to the employment and earnings of children receiving AFDC. Under current law, income earned by children can reduce the family's overall AFDC payment. The South Dakota demonstration will disregard such earnings for children who are attending school at least part-time. Children will be permitted to have a savings account of up to \$1,000. Additionally, AFDC children 14 and over, who are employed part-time, will be permitted to own an automobile worth up to \$2,500.

The South Dakota demonstration will involve a rigorous evaluation that utilizes random assignment to experimental and control groups.

South Dakota's request was received Aug. 6, 1993, and approved March 14, 1994.

VERMONT:

Vermont's "Family Independence Project" (FIP) promotes work by enabling AFDC recipients to retain more income and accumulate more assets than is normally allowed. FIP also requires AFDC recipients to participate in community or public service jobs after they have received AFDC for 30 months for most AFDC families, 15 months for families participating in the unemployed parent component of AFDC. Current child support payments will now go directly to families entitled to them. Vermont's request was received Oct. 27, 1992, and granted April 12, 1993.

VIRGINIA:

Virginia's "Welfare Reform Project" will encourage employment by identifying employers who commit to hire AFDC recipients for jobs that pay between \$15,000 and \$18,000 a year and by providing additional months of transitional child care and health care benefits. A second statewide project will: enable AFDC families to save for education or home purchases by allowing the accumulation of up to \$5,000 for such purposes; encourage family formation by changing the way a stepparent's income is counted; and allow full-time high school students to continue to receive AFDC benefits until age 21. Further, in up to four counties,

AFDC recipients who successfully leave welfare for work may be eligible to receive transitional benefits for child and health care for an additional 24 months, for a total of 36 months. In one location, Virginia will offer a guaranteed child support "insurance" payment to "DC families who leave welfare because of employment to assist the family in maintaining economic self-sufficiency. Virginia's request was received July 13, 1993, and granted Nov. 23, 1993.

WISCONSIN:

Wisconsin's reform plan, "Work Not Welfare," will require that most AFDC recipients either work or look for jobs. The plan provides case management, employment activities and work experience to facilitate employment. Receipt of AFDC benefits will be limited to 24 months in a four-year period, except under certain conditions, such as an inability to find employment in the local area due to a lack of appropriate jobs. Upon exhaustion of benefits, recipients become ineligible for 36 months.

With exceptions, children born while a mother receives AFDC will not be counted in determining a family's AFDC grant. In addition, child support will now be paid directly to the AFDC custodial parent in cases where the funds are collected by the state. Wisconsin's request was received July 14, 1993, and granted Nov. 1, 1993.

WYOMING:

Wyoming's reform plan will encourage AFDC recipients to enroll in school, undertake a training program, or enter the workforce. Wyoming's plan will allow "DC families with an employed parent to accumulate \$2,500 in assets, rather than the current ceiling of \$1000.

Wyoming will promote compliance with work and school requirements with tough penalties: AFDC minor children who refuse to stay in school or accept suitable employment could have their monthly benefit reduced by \$40; and adult AFDC recipients who are required to work or perform community service, but refuse to do so, face a \$100 cut in their monthly benefit. Also, Wyoming will severely restrict eligibility for adults who have completed a post-secondary educational program while on welfare, and will deny payment to recipients who have confessed to or been convicted of program fraud until full restitution is made to the State.

Unemployed, non-custodial parents of AFDC children who are not paying child support can now be ordered, by the courts, into Wyoming's JOBS program. Wyoming's request was received May 20, 1993, and granted Sept. 7, 1993.

###

Contact:

Press Office
Administration for Children and Families
(202) 401-9215

Fact Sheet

Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program

Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) provides financial assistance to needy families with dependent children. Federal and state governments share in its cost. The federal government provides broad guidelines and program requirements. Responsibility for program formulation, benefit determinations, and administration lies with the states. Eligibility for benefits varies by state and is based on the state's standard of need as well as the income and resources available to the recipient.

Eligibility Requirements

In order to be eligible for AFDC, a family must have a dependent child who is:

- Under age 18 (A state may elect to extend the age limit to include 18-year-olds who are expected to complete secondary school or the equivalent level of vocational or technical training before turning 19.);
- Deprived of parental support or care because of a parent's death, continued absence, incapacity, or the unemployment of the principal family earner in a two-parent family under the AFDC-Unemployed Parent (UP) program;
- Living in the home of a parent or other specified, close relative;
- A resident of the state; and
- A U.S. citizen or an alien permanently and lawfully residing in the U.S.

Along with the dependent child, an application for AFDC includes any eligible natural or adoptive parent and any eligible blood-related or adoptive sibling with whom the child is living.

Income and Financial Need Considerations

Each state sets its own need standard for determining eligibility. The term "need standard" refers to what a state determines that a particular size family needs to live. A state takes into consideration the needs as well as the income and resources of all individuals in the assistance unit. The state "disregards" some family income, thus permitting it to be retained along with AFDC payments.



Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children and Families
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20447
Phone: (202) 401-9215 \ April 1993

The determination of income eligibility is a two-step process. First, the gross income of the assistance unit, after applicable disregards, cannot exceed 185 percent of the state-determined need standard. The disregards include the first \$50 per month of child support received by the family and optional earned income disregards for certain students.

Second, the family income is compared to the state's need standard. In addition to the disregards described above for the 185 percent test, the state must disregard the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and the following amounts of earned income:

- \$90 per month for work expenses for individuals employed full- or part-time;
- For an individual who received AFDC in at least one of the prior four months:
 - a) all of the monthly earned income of a child who is a full-time student or who is a part-time student and not employed full-time;
 - b) \$30 and one-third of such person's remaining income for the first four consecutive months, and \$30 for each of the eight subsequent months;
- For full-time workers -- actual expenses for dependent care up to \$175 per month for each dependent child who is at least age two or each incapacitated adult, and up to \$200 per month for each dependent child who is under age two. (For part-time workers, a lesser amount may be applicable at state option.)

Resource Limitations

The federal statute sets a maximum limit of \$1,000 in resources per assistance unit. Resources include such things as stocks, bonds, and real property. The family's place of residence, burial plots, and funeral agreements valued up to \$1,500 are excluded from this resource limit as is that amount of equity in an automobile. The state may set lower dollar amounts for total resources, funeral agreements, and the automobile, and may also exclude from consideration household necessities.

Benefit Calculations

Each state establishes its own payment standard to determine the assistance unit's benefit amount. The payment standard may be lower than the need standard and is generally the amount which the state actually pays to a family for assistance. The state determines the benefit amount by considering the countable income of all persons included in the assistance unit and applying it against the state's payment standard. Income disregarded in determining eligibility is also disregarded in calculating benefits.

Work Program Requirements

The Family Support Act of 1988 established a Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program and revamped the requirements for state-operated welfare-to-work programs. All states have JOBS programs in place. The program provides training, work experience, and education opportunities for AFDC recipients. Unless otherwise exempt, AFDC recipients are required to participate in JOBS as a condition of eligibility. The goal of JOBS is to promote self-sufficiency.

Program Operation

All 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam participate in the AFDC program. American Samoa is authorized under the Family Support Act of 1988 to operate an AFDC program. States must submit plans and plan amendments to the Department of Health and Human Services for approval.

Federal Financial Participation

The federal government reimburses the states for operating an AFDC program with matching funds. Federal financial participation is provided to the states at different rates for various activities. Administrative and training costs are matched at a 50 percent rate; optional fraud control activities at 75 percent; and statewide automated information systems at 90 percent. AFDC benefit payment costs are matched under a formula which takes into account a state's per capita income relative to national per capita income. The federal matching rate for AFDC benefits may range from 50 percent for states with the highest per capita income to 83 percent for the state with the lowest per capita income.

Caseload and Expenditures -- Fiscal Year 1992

AFDC Caseload

Average No. of Monthly Families _____	4,768,495
Average No. of Monthly Recipients _____	13,625,342

Benefit Expenditures

Total _____	\$21.9 billion
Average Monthly Benefits (per Family) _____	\$383.45
Average Monthly Benefits (per Recipient) _____	\$134.20

Fact Sheet

Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) Program

The Family Support Act of 1988 created JOBS, a comprehensive welfare-to-work program. JOBS provides recipients of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) with the opportunity to take part in job training, work, and education-related activities that lead to economic self-sufficiency. JOBS also provides welfare recipients with necessary support services, such as transportation and child care. JOBS is generally the responsibility of the state welfare agency. However, in some areas, JOBS is under the administration of an Indian and Native Alaskan Tribe or Organization.

The Primary Goal of JOBS – Self-Sufficiency

The ultimate purpose of JOBS is to improve a family's ability to become and remain self-sufficient. It targets resources to those AFDC recipients most at risk for long-term welfare dependency, especially young, never-married mothers and teenaged parents who did not complete high school. It also focuses on AFDC recipients who have been on welfare a long time and who are difficult to employ.

Fundamental Shift in Welfare Policy

Passage of the Family Support Act and the establishment of JOBS reflect a basic rethinking of the welfare system. It no longer merely provides cash assistance to meet the basic needs, but now encourages economically disadvantaged individuals and families to gain skills that allow them to move permanently into the economic mainstream, while cash assistance is considered temporary.

The new system places primary responsibility for JOBS implementation and accountability with the state welfare agency. Welfare agencies have the authority to provide job training, employment, and education-related services as well as cash assistance. These agencies have considerable flexibility to design JOBS programs. New relationships among welfare agencies and other state and local agencies, community-based organizations, educational institutions, and public interest groups demonstrate this shift in welfare policy.

Program Flexibility

States and local agencies understand what their AFDC recipients need in order to find and keep jobs in their own communities. They have significant flexibility to tailor and implement JOBS programs to meet these special needs. While the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) sets program goals and provides enhanced funding, states determine the appropriate types of services to offer to help their welfare clients overcome employment obstacles.



Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children and Families
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20447
Phone: (202) 401-9215 \ April 1993

Making it Easier for Families to Participate in JOBS

JOBS helps AFDC recipients have access to vital supportive services, such as transportation and child care which make it easier to take part in JOBS. By funding these services, the Family Support Act provides states with a powerful tool to help welfare recipients achieve economic independence.

States may fund child care through vouchers, direct payments, or other types of financing. It may be provided by relatives, neighbors, family day care providers, independent contractors, or day care centers.

Generally, AFDC recipients who have found employment and no longer need cash assistance are eligible to receive up to one year of transitional child care and medical assistance.

The Link Between JOBS and Child Support

The Family Support Act emphasizes the link between earned income among AFDC recipients and effective child support enforcement. In fact, it requires that state welfare agencies furnish JOBS, AFDC, and child support benefits in an integrated way. An underlying theme of this legislation is that both parents, whether or not they are living together, must be involved in financially supporting their children. Child support payments ensure that custodial parents who are participating in JOBS receive the financial assistance they need from an absent parent for their children's well-being and family's economic stability.

Encouraging Extensive Coordination and Partnerships

The Administration for Children and Families has a strong leadership role in developing linkages among programs and throughout all levels of government. ACF promotes integration among the AFDC, JOBS, and Child Support Enforcement programs. ACF encourages active dialogue among organizations such as employment, job training, education, child support enforcement, child care, and community action agencies. It also supports collaboration with the business community to increase job training and work opportunities for JOBS participants.

AFDC Unemployed Parent Program

The Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Unemployed Parent (AFDC-UP) program provides assistance to families in which a child is deprived because one of the parents in the household is unemployed. Under the provisions of the Family Support Act of 1988, the program is mandatory in all states.

The Family Support Act of 1988 allows certain states to limit the period of assistance. However, these states must provide eligible families with AFDC-UP benefits for at least six months a year. AFDC-UP covers families in which both parents are living in the household and the principal earner, whether the father or the mother, is unemployed.

Eligibility Requirements

In order to be eligible for AFDC-UP, a family must meet all of the regular eligibility requirements for AFDC. A family must have a dependent child who is:

- under age 18;
- living in the home of both parents;
- a resident of the state; and
- a U.S. citizen or alien permanently and lawfully residing in the U.S.

In addition, eligibility is based on the unemployment of the parent who is the principal earner. The principal earner is whichever parent earned the greater amount of income in the 24-month period immediately preceding application for aid.

Before a family can receive aid, the principal earner must have been unemployed for at least 30 days. As defined in regulation, a person who works less than 100 hours a month is considered to be unemployed.

The principal earner must demonstrate a recent attachment to the labor force by having (a) six or more quarters of work in any 13-calendar-quarter period ending within one year prior to application for aid, or (b) received (or qualified for) unemployment compensation within one year prior to application for aid.

A principal earner may establish quarters of work in the following ways:

- Receive \$50.00 or more of earned income in a calendar quarter;
- Qualify for a quarter of coverage under the Social Security program; or
- Participate in the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program.

At the option of the state, a principal earner may establish up to four of the six required quarters of work in the following ways:



Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children and Families
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20447
Phone: (202) 401-9215 \ April 1993

- full-time that is designed to prepare the individual for gainful employment; or
Participate in an education or training program established under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).

If qualified, the principal earner must apply for and accept unemployment compensation.

Work Requirements

In any month, including the 30-day period prior to receipt of aid, the principal earner cannot refuse, without good cause, a bona fide offer of employment.

If the principal earner is exempt from participating in work or training activities because of living too far away from the JOBS program location, that individual must register with a public employment office in the state.

At least one parent in a family must participate for at least 16 hours a week in a work supplementation program, a community or other work experience program, on-the-job training, or a state-designed work program.

If a parent is under age 25 and has not completed high school, the state may require the parent to participate in educational activities directed at attaining a high school diploma (or equivalent), or in another basic education program.

If the principal earner fails to meet the work and training requirements, and the second parent is not participating in JOBS, the needs of the principal earner and of the other parent will not be taken into account in determining the family's need for assistance and the amount of its assistance payment.

Caseload and Expenditures -- Fiscal Year 1992

AFDC-UP Caseload

Average Monthly Families _____	321,771
Average Monthly Recipients _____	1,347,755

AFDC-UP Benefit Expenditures

(Federal and State) _____	\$2.1 billion
---------------------------	---------------

AFDC-UP Average Monthly Benefits

Per Family _____	\$550.46
Per Recipient _____	\$131.42

Child Support Enforcement Program

The goal of the Child Support Enforcement (CSE) Program, which was established in 1975 under Title IV-D of the Social Security Act, is to ensure that children are financially supported by both their parents. Recent laws, including the Family Support Act of 1988, provide for strong child support enforcement measures to assure that parental responsibility is met.

The CSE program is usually run by state and local human services departments, often with the help of prosecuting attorneys, other law enforcement agencies, and officials of family or domestic relations courts.

Child Support Enforcement services are available automatically for families receiving assistance under Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) programs. A family receives up to the first \$50 of any current child support each month without a decrease in the AFDC payment. Any remainder reimburses the state and federal governments for AFDC payments made to the family. AFDC recipients must assign to the state any rights to support that they or eligible children may have.

Child support services are also available to families not receiving AFDC who apply for such services. Child support payments that are collected on behalf of non-AFDC families are sent to the family. For these families, states must charge an application fee of up to \$25, but may pay such fee from state funds. Some states may also charge for the cost of services rendered.

The most recent census data show that in 1989 approximately 10 million women were raising a total of 16 million children under age 21 whose fathers were not living in the household. Of these women, only 58 percent, or 5.7 million women had been awarded child support. Among the women due child support payments in 1989, half received the full amount due, a quarter received partial payment, and a quarter received nothing. Of the total \$16.3 billion owed for child support in 1989, \$5.1 billion was not paid.

During FY 1992, almost \$8 billion in child support payments was collected under this program. Paternity was established for more than 515,000 children that year, clearing the way for the establishment of child support orders and other vital links between the children and their non-custodial parents.

There are four major services provided by the Child Support Enforcement Program:

1. Locating Absent Parents
2. Establishing Paternity
3. Establishing Child Support Obligations
4. Enforcing Child Support Orders

1. **Locating Absent Parents** - Child support enforcement officials use local information and resources of State and Federal Parent Locator services to locate parents for child support enforcement, or to find a parent in parental kidnapping/custody disputes.



State:
Motor Vehicles/Drivers Licenses
Employment/Unemployment Records
State Income Tax
Public Assistance Records

Federal:
Internal Revenue Service
Department of Defense
Social Security Administration
Veterans Administration
Selective Service System
Federal civilian personnel records

About four million cases are processed annually by the Federal Parent Locator Service. The FPLS provides an address in approximately 80 percent of the cases submitted.

2. Establishing Paternity - Establishing paternity (legally identifying a child's father) is a necessary first step for obtaining an order for child support when children are born out of wedlock. Establishing paternity also provides access to:

- Social security, pension and retirement benefits;
- Health insurance and information; and
- Interaction with members of both parents' families

Many fathers voluntarily acknowledge paternity. Otherwise, father, mother, and child can be required to submit to genetic tests. The results are highly accurate. States must have procedures which allow paternity to be established at least up to the child's eighteenth birthday.

3. Establishing Support Obligations - States must have guidelines to establish how much a parent should pay for child support. Support agency staff can take child support cases to court, or to an administrative hearing process to establish the order. Health insurance coverage can also be ordered.

4. Enforcing Child Support Orders - A parent can be required to pay child support by income withholding - money held out of the paycheck by the employer and sent to the child support office or court. Overdue child support can be collected from federal and state income tax refunds. Liens can be put on property, and the property itself may even be sold with the proceeds used to pay child support arrearages. Unpaid child support can be reported to credit bureaus so that a parent who owes child support may have trouble making purchases on credit.

Child Care Programs

The Administration for Children and Families (ACF) administers a variety of programs to help low-income families obtain child care services. ACF child care services focus on assisting individuals in low-income families who are employed, or are in training for employment, and who need child care to achieve or sustain self-sufficiency. Child care assistance is available through the states in the following four programs: the Child Care and Development Block Grant; At-Risk Child Care; Child Care for AFDC Recipients; and Transitional Child Care.

Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG)

The Child Care and Development Block Grant provides low-income families with the financial resources to find and afford quality child care for their children. In addition, CCDBG increases the availability of early childhood development and before- and after-school care services. Funds are available to states, Indian Tribes, and territories to provide grants, contracts, and certificates for child care services for low-income families. To be eligible, a family must need child care either because a parent is working, attending a training or educational program, or because the family receives or needs to receive protective services.

This program emphasizes the role of parents in choosing the care that best meets their family's child care needs. Parents may choose from a variety of child care providers, including center-based, family child care and in-home care, care provided by relatives, and sectarian child care providers.

Grantees must ensure that child care providers meet minimum health and safety requirements and set procedures. In addition, during normal hours of operation, parents must have unlimited access to their children and the providers.

FY 1992 funds were awarded to 261 grantees, including 52 states, 4 territories, and 205 Indian Tribes.

Since September 1991, ACF has provided states with more than \$1.5 billion in CCDBG funds. For FY 1993, almost \$893 million is available. No state matching funds are required.

At-Risk Child Care

The At-Risk Child Care program gives states the option of providing child care to low-income working families who are not receiving AFDC, who need child care in order to work, and who would be at risk of becoming dependent on AFDC if they did not receive child care assistance. Families must contribute to the cost of care according to their ability to pay.

The central point of program planning, design, and administration with the state welfare



agency. In this way, state agencies, which also have the responsibility for providing welfare, employment, and related services under the Job Opportunities and Basic Skills Training (JOBS) program, can coordinate child care with these services.

States may provide child care in the following ways:

- Directly;
- By arranging care through providers by use of purchase of service contracts or vouchers;
- By providing cash or vouchers in advance to the family;
- By reimbursing the family;
- By adopting such other arrangements as the state agency deems appropriate.

All child care providers must meet applicable state and local standards and allow for parental access.

Congress appropriated \$300 million for this program for FY 1993. State matching funds are required.

Title IV-A Child Care

Title IV-A Child Care provides funds for AFDC applicants and recipients through the AFDC and JOBS programs. This financial support allows them to pursue employment or work training and approved education which will help them to become economically self-sufficient.

Congress appropriated \$371 million for FY 1993. State matching funds are required. In FY 1991, 154,720 families, including those receiving transitional child care, were served.

Transitional Child Care

Transitional child care continues child care assistance for up to 12 months after a recipient leaves AFDC as a result of increased work hours, higher wages, or the loss of earned income disregards. Congress appropriated \$75 million in federal funds for FY 1993. State matching funds are required. For FY 1992, a monthly average of over 60,000 children were served.

Other ACF Child Care Activities

Several other ACF activities play a vital role in the delivery of child care services:

- AFDC Child Care Disregards support AFDC recipients' efforts to work by providing offsets against income from work for a portion of recipients' child care costs.
- The Head Start program, while not specifically targeted to provide child care, offers comprehensive services to enhance the development of low-income pre-school children. Head Start and the CCDBG can develop mutually beneficial arrangements

to provide extended day child care for Head Start children who need it due to their parents' work or training schedules, or to provide CC&DBG recipients with a Head Start experience.

- Dependent Care Planning and Development Grants are made to states to pay 75 percent of the planning and development costs for establishing information and referral systems and school-age child care.

The Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) enables states to provide social services which are best suited to the needs of its residents. Services can include child care.

- Child Welfare Services are available to states to provide child care and to help child care centers meet licensing requirements. In addition, as a complement to the state grant program, the Temporary Child Care/Crisis Nurseries program awards grants to public and non-profit agencies for research, demonstration, and training.

HHS NEWS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

August 1993

**Contact: Melissa Skolfield
Office of Public Affairs
(202) 690-7850**

A Brief Overview of the EITC and Welfare Reform

Contrary to popular understanding, work is not a guarantee to escaping poverty. In 1991, 9.2 million workers were poor, 2.1 million of whom worked full-time, year-round. Fully 5.5 million people lived in poor families with children which contained one full-time, year-round worker.

The Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) is a refundable tax credit designed to help the working poor. The credit offsets the tax liability of low-income heads of household and is paid as a percentage of earnings to a certain maximum.

The recently-passed reconciliation bill includes a major expansion of the EITC which would achieve President Clinton's goal of enabling families of four with a full-time worker to reach the poverty line. The five-year cost of this expansion is \$20.8 billion, with \$7.0 billion spent in fiscal year 1998.

Under the provision, working poor families with two or more children would receive a \$4 wage supplement through the EITC for every \$10 of the first \$8,425 they earn. A family of four with full-time, full year minimum wage earnings would receive the maximum credit of \$3,370.

For families with two or more children, the credit phases out at a rate of 21 cents for each dollar earned above \$11,000. Eligible tax filers making up to \$27,000 in earnings will still receive a credit.

For the first time, a credit will also be available for low-income workers without children. A childless worker would receive a maximum credit of \$306 based on earnings between \$4,000 and \$5,000. Nearly five million workers without children who have very low incomes (less than \$9,000) and are between the ages of 25 and 64 would also benefit.

Compared to the situation with no EITC at all, the enacted legislation would amount to a 40 percent higher return from working for low-income families with children. Compared to current law, a two-parent family with two children and one wage-earner working full-time at minimum wage would get \$1,375 more per year. In effect, this raises the pay for such a person by 16 percent over the situation under prior law.

page two -- A Brief Overview of the EITC and Welfare Reform

The expansion will substantially increase the anti-poverty effectiveness of government tax and welfare policy. In 1994, when the enacted legislation is fully implemented, approximately 1.5 million people will be removed from poverty, even if no more people go to work. And we expect more people to go to work.

Enactment of the expanded EITC is an important first step in the welfare reform effort. One of the major principles in reforming welfare is to "make work pay." The expansion of the EITC significantly increases the return from work and increases the incentive to begin work. It lays a solid foundation for the Administration's welfare reform plan-anticipated later this year--to make work a more viable option than welfare.

MEMORANDUM

To: David Ellwood, Bruce Reed

From: Toby Graff

Subject: Meeting with the Corporation for Enterprise Development,
National Alliance of Business and Progressive Policy Institute

Date: April 7, 1994

1. Participants:

The meeting with the Corporation for Enterprise Development (CFED), the National Alliance of Business (NAB) and the Progressive Policy Institute (PPI) will be held tomorrow, April 8, at 11:00 a.m. The meeting will take place in Bruce Reed's office. The following individuals will be participating in the meeting:

Bob Friedman, Chair of the West Coast Office, Corporation for Enterprise Development
Steve Golightly, Vice President for Government Affairs, National Alliance of Business
Wesley McClendon, National Alliance of Business
Will Marshall, President, Progressive Policy Institute
Lynn Hogan, Progressive Policy Institute

Working Group members and staff that will be attending the meeting are: Emily Bromberg, Jeremy Ben-Ami, and Patricia Sosa.

2. Purpose

The purpose of this meeting is to get the meeting participant's feedback on the current welfare proposal. The organizations are specifically interested in discussing the provisions of the WORK program. We would also like to get recommendations from these organizations on how to best structure rollout of the plan.

3. Background

As you know, we have kept in close contact with each of these organizations throughout the welfare reform process. Each organization testified at one of the public hearings and have attended several meetings with you and/or Mary Jo Bane. They represent our core group of support presently and are all very willing to work with us on the development, introduction and implementation of the welfare reform plan.

cc:
Emily Bromberg
Jeremy Ben-Ami
Patricia Sosa

WR - Mfgs.

AGENDA
Strategy meeting
Welfare Reform

4/6/94

- I. Intros
- II. Timing/Rollout
 - o Review status
 - o Initial consideration of rollout (continue next time)
- III. Legislative Strategy/Current Status
- IV. Message/Packaging
 - o Presentation of proposed talking points
- V. Intergovernmental
 - o Friday DGA meeting

TO: Bruce Reed
FR: Margaret Pugh^{up}
DT: March 31, 1994
RE: NCSL Welfare Reform Meeting

Bruce -- I wanted to get in touch with you before today's 1 p.m. meeting to make sure you had the information you needed from NCSL and to quickly go over the details of the agenda. Jim Ivery should have faxed you the NCSL's materials earlier this week; the agenda is attached. It's over at NCSL's offices in the Hall of the States. We should have several staff people in attendance as well as more staff and some legislators themselves by phone. John will not be there for the first part of the meeting, but will be there for the discussion of next steps and future plans.

Some things that might be helpful to know in advance:

- o Grace Drake (R) and Tom Bates (D) are the co-chairs of the NCSL's welfare reform committee; Assemblyman Bates testified at our forum in Sacramento last fall and recently has introduced legislation that would implement significant streamlining measures, using his district as a pilot site; John and I will be having follow-up conversation with Bates to explore the coordination of a group of Dem legislators supportive of our proposal.
- o Your discussion of process and timetable can be the usual bit; of course, they will want to know about financing. We are anticipating having staff-level conversations about our financing options in the near future; you should not feel pressed to discuss details in this context.
- o Issues of concern to the Administration could be addressed as a component of the process discussion. All attendees should be very familiar with the issues left unresolved in the February document. I think the overlap with their listed issues of concern should prompt our moving into this broader discussion quickly. We need to remember that this is their chance to tell us what THEY think; we have already made them aware of where we are in the process.
- o Next steps: As the process moves forward, we are becoming more explicit about wanting letters of endorsement from these groups at the end of the day. John should have arrived at the meeting by the time this topic is raised; depending on the tone of the discussion, he may address the issue of a letter. If not, this will be raised in our private staff discussions later.

Bruce -- thanks for doing this. It will be pretty painless. I'll see you at 1:00.

Proposed Agenda

- I. Roll Call
Welcome
Sen. Grace Drake, Co-chair, Ohio
Assem. Tom Bates, Co-chair, California
- II. Update on Administration's Activities
(discussion of process, timetable, recent decisions)
Bruce Reed
Deputy Domestic Policy Advisor
The White House
- III. Issues of Concern to the Administration
(areas where the Administration wants NCSL's input)
 - Bruce Reed
 - Responses: Legislators and staff of the Task Force
- IV. Issues of Concern Outlined by Task Force Members
 - o The WORK program: responsibilities of states, recipients, federal government; what kinds of education and training; work for wages or work for welfare; how many hours of work? What is long-term after the two-year time-limit? Kinds of work and administrative costs; Displacement.
 - o Targeting: new applicants, under 25? Phase-in?
 - o Child Care: entitlement; coverage; working poor; states regaining the ability to regulate; flexibility of funding streams.
 - o Financing: program costs; how will the program be paid for: match; state costs; what we've read in the newspaper; gambling tax, taxation of benefits, eliminating noncitizens eligibility for SSI benefits, removing child-only households from AFDC.
 - o Child Support Enforcement
 - o Flexibility: retaining state options; exemptions, extensions, floors, ceilings, states with high unemployment
 - o Part time vs. full time work - part-time and two year time-limits?
 - o Parental responsibility
- V. Future Plans



NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES

444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, N.W. SUITE 515 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001
202-624-6100 FAX: 202-737-1089

ROBERT T. CONNOR
SENATE MINORITY WHIP
DELAWARE
PRESIDENT, NCSL

MEMORANDUM

JOHN TURCOTTE
DIRECTOR, JOINT FISCAL COMMITTEE
MISSISSIPPI
STAFF CHAIR, NCSL

To: Members of the NCSL Welfare Reform Task Force

From: Sheri Steisel, Committee Director

Date: March 23, 1994

Subject: Conference Call Meeting with Bruce Reed, Deputy Domestic
Policy Advisor at the White House
Thursday, March 31, 1994
1:00 pm - 3:00 pm EST

WILLIAM FOLIND
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Yesterday, the Administration's Working Group on Welfare Reform delivered their recommendations and a series of options to President Clinton. There have been a series of Cabinet meetings, but no final decisions have been made, especially on financing. These options are discussed in the Feb. 26 draft that I sent to you last week.

Bruce Reed, co-chair of the Working Group and Deputy Domestic Policy Advisor to the President, wants to meet with you to hear your comments, reactions and suggestions to the draft. This would also be an excellent time to discuss financing issues as mentioned in the media.

The meeting will be held on Thursday, March 31, 1994 from 1:00 - 3:00 pm EST in Washington, DC in our NCSL Large Conference Room, 444 North Capitol Street, NW, Suite 515. To attend by conference call, please call (800) 837-1011 a few minutes before 1:00 pm. I urge you and your staff to attend either in person or by conference call.

Please call Crystal Clark, my assistant, as soon as possible at (202) 624-8669 to confirm your attendance. She can also send you another copy of the Feb. 26 draft if needed. Feel free to call me at (202) 624-8693 with any questions or to discuss the draft.

Proposed Agenda

- I. Roll Call
Welcome
Sen. Grace Drake, Co-chair, Ohio
Assem. Tom Bates, Co-chair, California
- II. Update on Administration's Activities
(discussion of process, timetable, recent decisions)
Bruce Reed
Deputy Domestic Policy Advisor
The White House
- III. Issues of Concern to the Administration
(areas where the Administration wants NCSL's input)
 - Bruce Reed
 - Responses: Legislators and staff of the Task Force
- IV. Issues of Concern Outlined by Task Force Members
 - o The WORK program: responsibilities of states, recipients, federal government; what kinds of education and training; work for wages or work for welfare; how many hours of work? What is long-term after the two-year time-limit? Kinds of work and administrative costs; Displacement.
 - o Targeting: new applicants, under 25? Phase-in?
 - o Child Care: entitlement; coverage; working poor; states regaining the ability to regulate; flexibility of funding streams.
 - o Financing: program costs; how will the program be paid for: match; state costs; what we've read in the newspaper; gambling tax, taxation of benefits, eliminating noncitizens eligibility for SSI benefits, removing child-only households from AFDC.
 - o Child Support Enforcement
 - o Flexibility: retaining state options; exemptions, extensions, floors, ceilings, states with high unemployment
 - o Part time vs. full time work - part-time and two year time-limits?
 - o Parental responsibility
- V. Future Plans

Wellfare Reform Task Force 3/31/94

Senator Judith Zaffirini, TX	(512) 463-0121	Maybe, staff yes-Gay Curry
Representative Margaret Martin, VT	(802) 388-7697	No
Representative Marian Owens, AK	(501) 226-5646	Will call back
Representative Lee Plasier, IA	(515) 281-5381	No
Representative Bill Purcell, TN	(615) 741-1778	No
Representative David Richardson, PA	(717) 787-3181	No, staff yes-Nia Wilson
Assemblyman Sheldon Silver, NY	(518) 455-4100	Cebew McConke will call back; Jeff Wise will be in person
Representative Georganna Sinkfield, GA	(404) 656-9210	Maybe
Senator Judy Baar Topinka, IL	(708) 442-0134	No, Van Esser will be representating her in person (IL General Assembly)
Senator Claire Traylor, CO	(303) 866-4866	No
Representative Becky Young, WI	(608) 266-3784	Yes
Representative George Albright, FL	(904) 488-0335	No answer
Senator Lane Beattie, UT	(801) 298-7000 (801) 538-4000	No, staff yes-Bryant Howe
Assemblyman Tom Bates, CA	(916) 445-7554	No, staff yes-Carol Wallish
Senator Bernest Cain, OK	(405) 524-0126	Yes
Representative Jane Campbell, OH	(216) 321-8400	Kay Powers will call back
Senator Donald DiFrancesco, NJ	(908) 322-5500	No

MAR-30-1994 16:18 FROM
03/30/94 13:41 202 737 1089
NCSL
TO
94567431 P.02
002

Senator Barbara Hoffman, MD	(410) 841-3810 (3648)	No
Senator Jim Lack, NY	(518) 455-2800	No, staff yes-Barbara Howard
Representative June Leonard, WA	(206) 786-7978	Yes, staff yes-Dave Knutson
Senator Grace Drake, OH	(614) 466-7505	Yes, staff yes-Stephanie
Senator Joe Holland, NY	(518) 455-3261	Will call back
Senator Robert Geake, MI	(517) 373-1707	Yes
Jeff Wice (NY State Assembly)	(202) 628-0752	Yes, in person
Geri Prock (NY State Senate)	5880	
Rich Bartholomew (NY State Senate)	5880	
Van Esser (IL General Assembly)	7894	Yes, in person
Rep. Kathleen Sebelius, KS		
Sen. Elayne Szonmiak, IA		
Sen. Diane Watson, CA		
Sheri Steisel, NCSL Staff	(202) 624-8693	Yes, in person
Michael Bird, NCSL Staff	(202) 624-8686	Yes, in person

03/30/94

13:42

202 737 1088

NCSL

004

Laurie Itkin, NCSL Staff	(202) 624-8675	Yes, in person
Ann Morse, NCSL Staff	(202) 624-8697	Yes, in person
Candace Romig, NCSL Denver Staff	(303) 830-2200	

Way

**WORKING GROUP ON WELFARE REFORM,
FAMILY SUPPORT AND INDEPENDENCE**

MEMORANDUM FOR MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP ON WELFARE REFORM,
FAMILY SUPPORT, AND INDEPENDENCE

FROM: MARY JO BANE
DAVID T. ELLWOOD
BRUCE REED
WORKING GROUP CO-CHAIRS

RE: WORKING GROUP MEETING ON SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 26

DATE: February 23, 1994

As we wrote you last week, the Working Group will meet on
Saturday, February 26 from 9 am to 5 pm.

This meeting will be for principals only.

Materials will be distributed at the meeting, and we will allow
time at the beginning of the day for you to review them.

The meeting will take place at:

White House Conference Center
726 Jackson Place
Truman Room
202-456-7507
(across Pennsylvania Avenue from the White House)

If you have not already done so, please call Ann McCormick as
soon as possible at 690-5880 to let her know whether you will be
able to attend.

Thank you.

Addressees: see attached list

**WORKING GROUP ON WELFARE REFORM,
FAMILY SUPPORT AND INDEPENDENCE**

Reed

MEMORANDUM FOR MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP ON WELFARE REFORM,
FAMILY SUPPORT, AND INDEPENDENCE

FROM: MARY JO BANE
DAVID T. ELLWOOD
BRUCE REED
WORKING GROUP CO-CHAIRS

RE: WORKING GROUP MEETING ON SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 26

DATE: February 14, 1994

As you know, since we last met as a full group, we have been developing the details of the ideas we discussed. We very much appreciate the cooperation that you and your staffs have provided.

We are making excellent progress, and there remains important work to be done before we are ready to introduce legislation this spring.

We have scheduled a meeting for the Working Group on Saturday, February 26 from 9 am to 5 pm. Materials will be available shortly before the meeting.

Please call Ann McCormick as soon as possible at 690-5880 to let her know whether you will be able to attend.

We will contact you shortly with the location and other details about the meeting.

Thank you.

Addressees: see attached list

Addressees:

Michael Alexander
Ken Apfel
Walter Broadnax
Michael Camunez
Robert Carver
Norma Cantu
Andrew Cuomo
Maria Echaveste
Chris Edley
Joycelyn Elders
Maurice Foley
Thomas Glynn
Ellen Haas
Elaine Kamarck
Augusta Kappner
Madeleine Kunin
Avis LaVelle
Marsha Martin
Alicia Munnell
Wendell Primus
Doug Ross
Isabel Sawhill
Marshall Smith
Eugene Sperling
Michael Stegman
Joseph Stiglitz
Fernando Torres-Gil
Jeff Watson
Kathi Way



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Secretary

Washington, D.C. 20201

February 2, 1994

MEMORANDUM TO: See Below

FROM: John Monahan, Director
Office of Intergovernmental Affairs

SUBJECT: Conference Call with Members of NCSL's Welfare Reform Task Force--ACTION

The National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) asked us to convene members of the Administration's Welfare Reform Working Group for a conference call with members of their welfare reform task force (list attached) to go over the draft document. While some legislators may have staff to represent them, we expect many legislators will actually participate, although some legislatures will be in session on Monday.

~~The call is scheduled for Monday, February 7th from 2-3:30 in Room 415F, HHH (Kathi and Bruce will be plugged in from OEOB). I will serve as moderator for our staff and Sheri Steisel will moderate for NCSL.~~

The agenda for the call is attached and I have taken the liberty of suggesting an issue area for each of you to cover on the call. If you want to rearrange any of these, please let us know at your earliest convenience. We have not shared these suggestions with NCSL. Each of you should give a brief (one minute) summary of what the document contains for that particular area, then open up for discussion with the NCSL representatives.

Among legislators participating in the call will be: Bill Purcell, Majority Leader of the Tennessee House; Sen. Dianne Watson, Chairperson of the California Health and Human Services Committee; Sheldon Silver, Speaker of the New York Assembly; and Sen. Joe Holland of New York.

If you have any questions, please call me or Jim Ivery of my staff. Jim can be reached on 690-6156.

Attachments (2)

Addressees:

Mary Jo Bane
David Ellwood
Bruce Reed
Wendell Primus
Paul Legler
Kathi Way

AGENDA

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES
WELFARE REFORM TASK FORCE
FEBRUARY 7, 1994
2:00pm EST

CONFERENCE CALL

1. Welcome and Introductions
Senator Grace Drake (OH), Co-Chair
Assemblyman Tom Bates (CA), Co-Chair
Sheri Steisel, NCSL Committee Director
2. Overview of Welfare Reform Process and Options
Administration Participants - DAVID ELLWOOD
3. Discussion of Options
Administration Participants and NCSL Task Force Member Responses
 - a. Transitional Assistance - MARY JO BANE
 - enhancing programs (education and training, JOBS)
 - time limited assistance
 - work
 - b. Make Work Pay - DAVID ELLWOOD
 - child care for working families
 - EITC
 - work incentives
 - c. Child Support Enforcement - PAUL LEGLER
 - d. Prevention and Parental Responsibility - BRUCE REED
 - e. Financing - DAVID ELLWOOD
 - f. Reinventing Government Assistance - KATHI WAY
 - simplification
 - preventing waste, fraud and abuse
 - performance standards and state flexibility
3. Wrap Up - JOHN MONAHAN

Both parents
SOW - Costs don't rain cats
3 Prevention ideas
① Teen moms
② Paternity estab
③ Nat. campaign - teen program
- already begun

02/01/94 18:02 202 737 1069

NCSL

002



NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES

444 NORTH CAPITOL STREET, N.W. SUITE 515 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20001
 TEL: 202-624-8400 FAX: 202-727-1069

ROBERT T. CONNOR
 SENATE MINORITY WHIP
 DELAWARE
 PRESIDENT, NCSL

JOHN TURCOTTE
 DIRECTOR
 JOINT F.F.E.L. COMMITTEE
 MISSISSIPPI
 STAFF CHAIR, NCSL

WILLIAM POLING
 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MEMORANDUM

To: NCSL Welfare Reform Task Force
 From: Sheri E. Steisel, NCSL
 Date: February 1, 1994
 Subject: Conference Call with President's Task Force Co-Chairs, February 7 at 2:00 pm est.

As promised, I have arranged a conference call with members of President Clinton's Working Group on Welfare Reform, Family Preservation and Independence. The conference call is set for 2:00 pm Eastern Standard Time on February 7, 1994.

To participate in the conference call, please phone 1-800-837-1011 a few minutes before 2:00 pm. We will begin at 2:00 pm promptly to accommodate our guests from the Administration. If you have any difficulty with the phone clarity, press 0 at any time during the call. I have confirmed attendance from David Ellwood, Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation at HHS and Co-Chair of the President's group; Bruce Reed, Deputy Domestic Policy Advisor at the White House, Co-Chair of the President's group; Wendell Primus, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation at HHS and Group member; Kathi Way, Special Assistant to the President at the White House and Group member; Paul Legler, Chair of the Child Support and Group member; and John Monahan, Director of Intergovernmental Affairs at HHS. If you are unable to attend, your staff are welcome.

Please contact my assistant, Crystal Clark, at 202-624-8669 as soon as possible to confirm your attendance. If you have any questions, please contact me at 202-624-8693. This conference call will focus on the December draft that was sent to you. I have added financing as a topic for discussion. If you need another copy, please call Crystal. If you have not sent in your written comments, please do so as soon as possible. I look forward to a productive discussion on Monday.

02/02/94 12:53 202 737 1069

NCSL

002



NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES

WASHINGTON OFFICE: 444 MORDEN CAPITOL STREET, NW SUITE 500 WASHINGTON, DC 20001 (202) 645-4200 FAX: (202) 737-1069

WELFARE REFORM TASK FORCE

Co-Chairs

Senator Grace Drake (OH)
Assemblyman Tom Bates (CA)

Members

Representative George Albright (FL)
Senator Lane Beattie (UT)
Senator Bernest Cain (OK)
Representative Jane Campbell (OH)
Senator Donald DiFrancesco (NJ)
Senator Barbara Hoffman (MD)
Senator Jim Lack (NY)
Representative June Leonard (WA)
Representative Margaret Martin (VT)
Representative Marian Owens (AK)
Representative Lee Plasier (LA)
Representative Bill Purcell (TN)
Representative David Richardson (PA)
Assemblyman Sheldon Silver (NY)
Representative Georganna Sinkfield (GA)
Senator Judith Baar Topinka (IL)
Senator Claire Traylor (CO)
Representative Becky Young (WI)
Senator Judith Zaffirini (TX)

Staff

Sheri E. Steisel, Committee Director
Crystal Clark, Administrative Assistant

JAN 07 '94 05:29PM NAT'L GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION

P.22

ATTENDEES FOR JANUARY 10 WELFARE REFORM MEETING

John Monahan
HHS

Kathi Way
DPC - *White House*

David Ellwood
HHS

Bruce Reed
DPC

Mary Jo Bane
HHS

Wendell Primus
HHS

Keith Mason
DPC *White House*

Barry Van Lare
NGA

Margie Siegal
NGA

Julie Strawn
NGA

LeAnne Redick
Michigan

Gerry Miller
Michigan

Liz Ryan
Delaware

Carmen Nozario
Delaware

Tom McCaffrey
California

Nikki McNamee
South Carolina

Kristen Ames
Oklahoma

Jeff Viohl
Indiana

Michael Dowling
New York

Maura Cullen
New York

Ed Kilgore
Georgia

Jim Ledbetter
Georgia

Melissa Baker
New York

Tim Hunt
Massachusetts

Evelyn Ganzglass
NGA



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Secretary

Washington, D.C. 20201

Intergovernmental Affairs

Facsimile Cover Sheet

To: Bruce Reed

Organization: _____

From: Margaret PughDate: 1/10/94

Intergovernmental Affairs
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Room 630F
Washington, DC 20201

Phone: 690-6036
Fax: (202) 690-5672

Recipient's Fax Number: 456-7739Number of pages including this sheet: 2

Remarks:

TO: David Ellwood
Mary Jo Bane
Bruce Reed
Co-Chairs, Working Group on Welfare Reform, Family
Support and Independence

FROM: Jim Hickman 

SUBJECT: Focus Group Meetings with AFDC Recipients

DATE: December 15, 1993

As part of the Working Group's on-going effort to include AFDC recipients in the formulation and evaluation of the welfare reform proposal, we will schedule several focus group meetings with recipients early in January 1994. The goal of the meetings will be to take our dialogue with recipients to the next level by discussing one or two policy initiatives in depth.

We would seek focus group participants who are a mix of enrolled and wait listed JOBS participants from local programs. Each meeting would be two hours in length. The recipients would be briefed by an appropriate staff person on one or two policy initiatives under consideration by the Working Group for the first hour. During the second hour, the Working Group Co-Chairs would join the meeting and review and discuss the policy issues with the recipients.

The first meeting will be sponsored by the Working Group. Additional meetings will be sponsored by either HHS solely or in conjunction with community foundations interested in welfare reform.

I will contact your staff to identify possible meeting times on your respective calendars. Please call me before then at 401-6958 if you have any suggestions regarding the participants, format, or timing of these meetings.

cc: Jeremy Ben-Ami
Ann McCormick
Wendell Primus
Ann Rosewater
Patricia Sosa

Draft #3

MEETING WITH THE STATE AND LOCAL WELFARE REFORM TASK FORCE

December 15, 1993, 10:30am - 3:30pm
Jackson Place Conference Center, Truman Room
726 Jackson Place, NW

AGENDA

10:30 - 10:45 INTRODUCTION

John Monahan
Kathi Way

- o An overview of the intergovernmental consultation process so far.
- o Format of today's meeting.
- o Next steps to be taken in discussing welfare reform options with the State and Local Task Force members and their organizations.

**10:45 - 11:15 OVERVIEW OF WELFARE REFORM POLICY:
PROCESS AND OPTIONS**

Mary Jo Bane
David Ellwood
Bruce Reed

- o An update on the welfare reform process by the Working Group co-chairs.
- o Broad overview of the options under consideration by the Working Group.

11:15 - 12:30 DISCUSSION OF OPTIONS -- PART I

- o Transitional Assistance
 - enhancing programs
 - making welfare transitional
 - transitional support and post-transitional jobs

12:30 - 1:00 LUNCH

1:00 - 3:30 DISCUSSION OF OPTIONS -- PART II

- o Child Support Enforcement
- o Reinventing Government Assistance
 - simplification
 - preventing waste, fraud and abuse
 - performance standards and state flexibility
- o Prevention and Parental Responsibility
- o Make Work Pay
 - child care for working families
 - EITC
 - work incentives

WELFARE REFORM BRIEFING

ROOSEVELT ROOM

November 23, 1993

I. Overview and Background

II. Highlights

- * Prevention and Parental Responsibility**
- * Helping Working People**
- * Child Support Enforcement**
- * Time-Limited Assistance Followed by Work**
- * Phase-in / Budget**

III. Related Developments

IV. Next Steps

~~Discussion Draft/Pres~~

WRWG

- Pres appointed in June
- 30 members from 8 agencies

-- Advisory Group of govs

5 hearings

- testimony from recips & caseworkers & 150 groups
- met with 200 advocacy organs
- Howard/bipartisan -- dozens of Reps
- Kathi/working closely with govs and state officials

Extraordinary consensus on policy recomms.

- all day Saturday: applause

Prepared to take this to Pres in early Dec

- more consultation and vetting with outside world
- we want to build a coalition of support before introduction

Waivers

- Wisc, Ga, Iowa,
Va., Ill

P

We wanted to meet with you this morning to give you some background on the WR proposals we've developed, and at the risk of trodding on your Thanksgiving weekend, ask you to read over an early draft of our plan and give us your comments before Carol sends anything on to the President.

This is just a discussion draft, and we've managed to keep it out of the press so far.

Pres appointed the WRWG in June
-- 30 members from 8 agencies

Also asked the Gobs and state officials to appoint advisory group

5 hearings across the country

- testimony from dozens of welfare recipients & caseworkers & 150 groups
- met with 200 advocacy organizations
- took Howard's advice/bipartisan -- met with dozens of Reps in both parties
- Kathi has met with gobs & state officials

Group has reached extraordinary consensus

- met all-day Saturday with all 30 members
- applauded at the end

We can talk later about where we go from here.

- Stop and turn over to David

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

TO: Distribution List

FROM: Carol H. Rasco *CHR*

SUBJ: Welfare Reform Update

DATE: November 4, 1993

Please set aside 10 a.m. to 12 noon on Tuesday, November 23 for a discussion on the Welfare Reform draft plans. The meeting will be held in the Roosevelt Room. At this meeting, the Task Force leadership will present to us options still under consideration. In order to keep the group small enough to acutally hold a discussion I am asking that we hold the meeting to the persons on the distribution listing with each of you certainly welcome to name a designee if you cannot be present.

Thank you.

DISTRIBUTION LIST:

Mack McLarty
Leon Panetta
Jack Quinn
David Gergen
George Stephanopoulos
Bob Rubin
Maggie Williams
Mark Gearan
Joan Baggett
Howard Paster
Marcia Hale
Alexis Herman
✓ Bruce Reed
Bill Galston
Kathi Way
Mary Jo Bane
David Ellwood

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

02-Nov-1993 10:55am

TO: Bruce N. Reed
TO: Kathryn J. Way

FROM: Carol H. Rasco
Economic and Domestic Policy

SUBJECT: Welfare Reform

I would like to set up a meeting on Tuesday, Nov. 23 to have the two of you along with Ellwood and Bane give a preliminary briefing to appropriate division heads within the White House on welfare reform and what will likely be proposed to the President. This needs to include preliminary (or even more firm) number runs. It is very important we have this internal meeting to flesh out those who are beginning to encourage we not include welfare reform next year. It needs to be as detailed as possible. Could you please work with Mary Jo and David and pick the best time of day for you four....need to plan on an hour at least.

Preliminary guest list would include: Gergen, George, Paster, Hale, Herman, Guerin, Rubin, OMB, VP, Baggett.

Let me know what time of day works best. Thanks.

Rasco

Gergen

GS - ?

Leon - ?

Alexis - ?

Joan

Kamark/Quinn

NEC

Howard - ?

Marcia Hale

→ Rahn

Tyson

1.

\$

2

TIME

No choice

CAROL → DR → mtg. w/WR

I. PROCESS

II. ~~OVERVIEW~~ HIGHLIGHTS OF PLAN

- Prevention

- Helping Working People

- CSE

- ~~Work~~ / Time-limited Assignment
Followed by work

- Budget/phase-in

IV. NEXT STEPS

- Cab mtg. w/BC

- Work closely on OMB, Treasury

- Feb. 1st

III. ~~OTHER PLANS~~ Related WR
~~Other Plans~~ Devers

- GOPs

- H. Ford

- M. Forum

- Shalala

- Waivers

- Moynihan

- GWS

- 30 of 33

→ Train is on track
Part of larger agenda -

**WORKING GROUP ON WELFARE REFORM,
FAMILY SUPPORT AND INDEPENDENCE**

November 16, 1993

Memorandum for: Bruce Reed, Bonnie Deane, Chris Lin, Cantu Pian
Bill Dickens, Jeremy Ben-Ami, Patricia Sosa

From: Toby Graff

Subject: Temporary Work/Transitional Employment Groups
Meeting

The meeting with the temporary work/transitional employment groups will be held on Wednesday, November 17, at 2:00 p.m., in the Seventh Floor Conference Room of the Aerospace Center, 901 D Street, S.W., Washington, D.C. The meeting participants are listed below.

National Restaurant Association - Lee Culpepper, Office of Government Relations

National Retail Federation - Steve Pfister, Vice President and Director of Political Affairs

Direct Selling Association - Twila Crawford
(possibly Neil Offen, President)

Manpower Temporaries - Mitch Fomstein, President

*A representative from Oldstein Temporaries may also attend

Welfare Reform Meeting

Thursday, November 4, 1993

Room 211, OEOB

10:30 a.m.

Attendees

White House

Bruce Reed
Belle Sawhill
Jody Greenstone
Bonnie Deane
Elaine Kamarck
Rahm Emanuel
Kathi Way
Reta Lewis
Barbara Chow
Keith Mason

HHS

David Ellwood (?)
Mary Jo Bane
Wendell Primus
Jeremy Ben-Ami
Mary Bourdette
John Monahan
Avis Lavelle
Melissa Skolfield
Margaret Pugh

Agriculture

Ellen Haas
Patti Morris
Julie Bernell
Neil Flieger

Welfare Reform Meeting
May 25, 1993
AGENDA

File WR - Mtgs
Memo to Pres
Gov cuts or Mayhew sop
Tulsa
1994 intro

→ Call Eli Segal

I. OVERVIEW

- A. Structure of Welfare Reform Working Group
 - 1. Differences from HCTF (POTUS involvement throughout process)
- B. Where we are on policy
- C. Timeline of report to POTUS and legislation

II. EVENTS/ACTIVITY

- A. POTUS event in the near future
 - 1. Should this happen before health care launch?
- B. Announcement of the Working Group
 - 1. If there is a POTUS event, should this happen simultaneously?
 - 2. If there is not a POTUS event, is there anything preventing the announcement of the Working Group through a press release ASAP?
- C. How active, if at all, should the President be on this issue prior to the completion of the report?
- D. How much press should the Working Group try to generate through its fact finding missions and hearings that will take place this summer?

III. MESSAGE

- A. Does the message need a more narrow focus?
- B. Are there a few central themes that should be emphasized at all times?
- C. At what point should more information be added?

IV. COORDINATION WITH HEALTH CARE

WORKING GROUP ON WELFARE REFORM, FAMILY SUPPORT AND INDEPENDENCE

TO: David Ellwood
Ellen Haas
Bruce Reed
Tom Corbett
Mack Storrs

FROM: Patricia Sosa, Director of Public Outreach, WRWG

SUBJECT: Meeting with Hunger Groups

DATE: October 13, 1993

The meeting that we have scheduled for this afternoon with several hunger advocates will be the Working Group's first meeting specifically with hunger organizations. The purpose of the meeting is primarily for the Working Group to hear their specific concerns regarding welfare reform. The individuals who will be meeting with us will do so as part of an anti-poverty coalition. They have all been meeting in town together this week.

As you know, the meeting is scheduled for Thursday, October 14 from 1:00 pm to 2:30 pm in Humphrey Room 415F, David Ellwood's conference room. From the Working Group, David Ellwood and Ellen Haas will attend; David will attend the first hour of the meeting only. Bruce Reed has been invited and might be able to attend. From the issue group on Welfare Simplification, Mack Storrs will attend. Additionally, Tom Corbett from Making Work Pay will attend the first half of the meeting.

The hunger advocates who have confirmed their attendance include:

Bill Ayres, World Hunger Year
David Beckmann, Bread for the World
Barbara Howell, Bread for the World
Lawrence Moore, Bread for the World
Rob Ferish, Food Research and Action Center
Ellen Vollinger, Food Research and Action Center
Sam Harris, RESULTS
Christina Martin, Foodchain
Christine Vladimiroff, Second Harvest
Augusta Homel, Second Harvest
Laura Waxman, U.S. Conference of Mayors (Washington, DC)
Darrell Johnson, Children's Defense Fund
Bill Whitaker, University of Maine, Maine Coalition for Food Security
Mayor Bruce Todd, U.S. Conference of Mayors (Austin, TX)

Aerospace Building • 370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W. • Suite 600 • Washington, D.C. 20447

**WORKING GROUP ON WELFARE REFORM,
FAMILY SUPPORT AND INDEPENDENCE**

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION COVER SHEET

**Aerospace Building
370 L'Enfant Promenade, S.W.
Seventh Floor
Washington, D.C. 20447
Fax: (202) 205-9688**

Date: 10/14

To: Cathy Mays

From: Helene Grady

Phone: _____

Phone: 401-4886

Fax: 456-7028

Fax: cover 4 pgs

Message: _____

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE WELFARE REFORM WORKING GROUP

By
David Beckmann, President
Bread for the World

August 19, 1993

Bread for the World is a Christian citizens' movement against hunger. Our 44,000 members across the country lobby their Members of Congress on issues that affect hungry people in our country and around the world.

Every year we focus the bulk of our energy on one issue. In planning for next year, we have polled hundreds of local leaders and staff in a wide range of church denominations. To my surprise, most of these people are urging us -- a hunger organization -- to focus on welfare reform. They see the process you are starting as our best opportunity in the coming year to reduce hunger.

We expect to generate between 100,000 and 200,000 letters to Congress about welfare reform in 1994. Our educational outreach through churches and the media will be even more widespread.

Basically, we want welfare reform that is aimed at reducing poverty, not just getting people off the welfare rolls.

We will be saying that effective welfare reform requires investment in a range of anti-poverty programs. Recent funding increases for the Earned Income Tax Credit, food stamps, and WIC will help. But to move welfare recipients up and out of poverty, we also need more funding for education and training, child support assurance, and public sector jobs.

On the other hand, time limits and workfare are likely to be expensive and not do much to reduce poverty. We don't want low-impact spending to crowd out planned increases for proven, cost-effective programs such as WIC, Head Start, and Job Corps.

We have not yet decided on precisely how to frame our welfare reform campaign and would welcome your advice.

We might focus on expansion of the JOBS program. Its support of basic and continuing education seems especially effective in helping people get jobs, and the JOBS program will be more widely adopted if the federal government pays for a bigger share of the costs.

Bread for the World might also rally support for child support assurance.

We appreciate the President's leadership on welfare reform, and we hope our planned campaign will encourage you to be bold in your recommendations.

local levels. The Campaign is being waged in partnership with a 50-state network of anti-hunger advocacy groups and emergency food providers. It has been endorsed by bipartisan leadership in Congress and by over 200 organizations representing a broad cross-section of Americans.

Bread for the World is a Christian citizens' movement against hunger. It has 44,000 members nationwide and lobbies Congress on issues affecting hungry people in this country and around the world. Bread for the World supports welfare reform initiatives that involve more funding for education and training, child support assurance and public sector jobs. Mr. Beckmann stated in his testimony that his group has not yet framed its national welfare reform campaign. Although they support reform, they do not support time limits and workfare programs that do not do much to reduce poverty.

World Hunger Year is a not for profit corporation founded in 1975 by the late singer Harry Chapin and Bill Ayres, present executive director. Based in New York, WHY helped to create the Presidential Commission on World Hunger (1978-80) and has established, among other things, WHY Magazine, the New York City Food and Hunger Hotline, Long Island Cares and the Center for Food Action in New Jersey. WHY's major program at present is Reinvesting in America which identifies and helps model grassroots programs that deal with hunger and poverty in all 50 states.

Second Harvest is a network of 185 affiliated food banks in the United States which provide food to the hungry through nearly 50,000 social service agencies. As the largest charitable source of food in the country, the Second Harvest network annually distributes more than 500 million pounds of donated food and grocery products. Second Harvest also works to educate the public about the nature of, and solutions to, the problems of hunger.

The Maine Coalition for Food Security has been organized by the Maine Nutrition Council and is responsible for disseminating Community Childhood Hunger Identification project (CCHIP) findings throughout Maine as part of the national Campaign to End Childhood Hunger.

cc: Jeremy Ben-Ami
Helene Grady

Previous contact with the Working Group:

Several of these groups or individuals have previously been involved with the Working Group. The Food Research and Action Council especially is a leading hunger organization with whom it is very important for the Working Group to work closely. Although they have not testified before the Working Group, we have been working closely with them on an informal basis. Ellen Vollinger from FRAC has taken the initiative in organizing this meeting.

In addition to FRAC, Bread for the World is a major player in the coalition of anti-hunger organizations. David Beckmann represented Bread for the World with testimony before the Working Group at the Washington DC hearing on August 19th. See attached Beckmann's statement from the hearing. Dr. James Chapin from World Hunger Year testified before the Working Group in New Jersey. Additionally, the Working Group has had much interaction with the U.S. Conference of Mayors and Children's Defense Fund, although never before on the issue of hunger.

Issues of concern:

Like most poverty advocates, hunger groups are extremely concerned about time limits. There is particular concern with the impact that time limits would have on nutritional programs for the poor, specifically food stamps and WIC.

Background information:

Below is a summary of the background information on the organizations that we have available:

FRAC is the leading national organization working to improve public policies to eradicate hunger and undernutrition in the United States. Founded in 1970 as a public interest law firm, FRAC is a nonprofit and nonpartisan research, public policy and legal center that serves as the hub of an anti-hunger network comprised of thousands of individuals and agencies.

FRAC is conducting ground-breaking research to document the extent of hunger and its impact on low-income families with children. FRAC also conducts media and public information campaigns to help promote changes in public attitudes and policies, and acts as an authoritative source of information on hunger for the news media, public officials and the American public.

One campaign by FRAC that could have an impact on our work is the long-term, nationwide Campaign to End Childhood Hunger. The Campaign, begun in March 1991, is designed to alert the public and policymakers as to the magnitude of childhood hunger, and to implement solutions to the problem at the national, state and

Welfare Reform Steering Committee

August 17, 1993 Agenda

Discussion of Transitional Support issues - Ann/Mary Ann
(30-40 minutes)

Issue Group discussion - group leaders (10-15 minutes)

Communications/political review - Jeremy/Patricia Sosa
(20-25 minutes)

August 24, 1993

TO: MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP ON WELFARE REFORM,
FAMILY SUPPORT, AND INDEPENDENCE

SUBJECT: AUGUST 25 MEETING

FROM: BRUCE REED
DAVID ELLWOOD
MARY JO BANE
WORKING GROUP CO-CHAIRS

REMINDER: The Working Group is meeting tomorrow, August 25, at 4:00 in room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. A presentation will be made by the Department of Education on Education Department programs serving AFDC recipients, and Education strategies to reduce welfare dependency.

ADDRESSEES:

Ken Apfel
Eleanor Acheson
Walter Broadnax
Robert Carver
Ray Cortines
Joycelyn Elders, M.D.
Maurice Foley
Thomas Glynn
Ellen Haas
Elaine Kamarck
Madeline Kunin
Alicia Munnell
Wendell Primus
Doug Ross
Julie Samuels
Isabel Sawhill
Eli Segal
Eugene Sperling
Michael Stegman
Joseph Stiglitz
Fernando Torres-Gil
Jeff Watson
Kathi Way

cc: Staff Contacts

August 24, 1993

TO: WELFARE REFORM WORKING GROUP STAFF CONTACTS

SUBJECT: AUGUST 25 WORKING GROUP MEETING

FROM: ANN McCORMICK

See attached memo.

ADDRESSEES:

Jeremy Ben-Ami
Susan Bender
Marcy Carlson
Robert Carver
Bonnie Deane
Bernie Delia
Chris Devlin
Karen Ewing
Mike Fishman
Stacey Grundman
Steve Hagy
Charlotte Hayes
Jill Khadduri
Cathy Mays
Wendy New
Francine Obermiller
Carol Roddy
Michele Rodman
Deborah Sorkin
Mildred Taylor
Cookie Walden
Judy Wurtzel

July 26, 1993

TO: MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP ON WELFARE REFORM,
FAMILY SUPPORT, AND INDEPENDENCE

SUBJECT: WORKING GROUP MEETINGS

FROM: BRUCE REED
DAVID ELLWOOD
MARY JO BANE
WORKING GROUP CO-CHAIRS

The Working Group will not meet this Wednesday, July 28. The next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, August 4 at 4:00. An agenda will follow.

Due to the welfare reform regional visit scheduled in Chicago on August 10-11, there will be no Working Group meeting here on August 11.

ADDRESSEES:

Ken Apfel
Eleanor Acheson
Walter Broadnax
Robert Carver
Ray Cortines
Joycelyn Elders, M.D.
Maurice Foley
Thomas Glynn
Ellen Haas
Elaine Kamarck
Madeline Kunin
Alicia Munnell
Wendell Primus
Doug Ross
Julie Samuels
Isabel Sawhill
Eli Segal
Eugene Sperling
Michael Stegman
Joseph Stiglitz
Fernando Torres-Gil
Jeff Watson
Kathi Way

cc: Staff Contacts

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR PLANNING AND EVALUATION



PHONE: (202) 690-~~XXXX~~⁷⁵⁰⁷ FAX: (202) 690-~~XXXX~~ 6562

Date: 8/2

From: Wendell

To: Bruce Reed

Division: _____

Division: _____

City & State: _____

City & State: _____

Office Number: _____

Office Number: _____

Fax Number: _____

Fax Number: 456-7739

Number of Pages + cover 2

REMARKS: Attached is material on post-trans. work for tomorrow's
Subcommittee breakfast. Please return any comments to
Marcy Carlson by 4:00pm today. Thanks.

Phone: 690-7409

Fax: 690-6562

For Discussion Purposes Only

SHOULD AFDC BENEFITS BE USED TO SUPPLEMENT WAGES IN HIGH BENEFIT STATES?

Should the program operate with uniform wage levels or should income supplements be provided in high benefit states to bring income of part-term workers to levels of current benefits?

HOW WOULD EARNINGS BE TREATED?

Are they subject to payroll and income taxes, EITC ?

WOULD THESE WORK EXPERIENCE SLOTS BE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHER POPULATIONS?

Should these jobs be available to non-custodial parents, individuals on transitional assistance, former AFDC recipients who have lost regular jobs, other low wage workers who have lost jobs?

WHAT KIND OF SANCTIONS SHOULD BE EMPLOYED?

Pay only for hours of work or AFDC-type sanctions.

HOW WOULD EARNINGS BE TREATED AS PARTICIPANTS MOVE INTO REGULAR JOBS?

Should income be disregarded? Should there be offsets for work and child care expenses?

WHAT FEDERAL AGENCY WOULD ADMINISTER THESE PROGRAMS? IS IT THE SAME AS THE SYSTEM THAT WOULD ADMINISTER THE TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM?

HHS, DOL, both as in WIN?

WHAT INCENTIVES ARE NEEDED TO ENCOURAGE STATES TO MAKE WORK SLOTS AVAILABLE? HOW MUCH FLEXIBILITY SHOULD STATES BE GIVEN IN DESIGNING THESE PROGRAMS?**HOW WOULD DISPLACEMENT BE MINIMIZED?**

For Discussion Purposes Only

POST-TRANSITIONAL WORK ISSUES

WHAT KIND OF WORK SHOULD IT BE?

CWEP program (hours are tied to benefit levels) or public service employment with set number of hours.

HOW MANY HOURS OF WORK PER WEEK SHOULD BE ASSIGNED?

Part time or full time.

HOW LONG SHOULD PARTICIPANTS BE ABLE TO REMAIN IN PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT?

Short term or permanent.

IF PUBLIC WORK IS OF LIMITED DURATION, WHAT HAPPENS AFTERWARDS?

Job search program, partial benefits, cold turkey

HOW LONG SHOULD PARTICIPANTS BE ABLE TO REMAIN IN EACH SPECIFIC WORK SLOT?

WHAT HAPPENS IF NO PUBLIC WORK SLOTS ARE AVAILABLE?

Should participants be enrolled in Job search with the same benefits as if they were working for 20 hours a week?

WHAT OTHER SERVICES SHOULD PARTICIPANTS BE ELIGIBLE FOR ?

ES services, job search, continuation of transitional services such as job counseling, job development services, child care and transportation?

SHOULD PARTICIPANTS HAVE ACCESS TO EDUCATION, TRAINING AND OTHER ACTIVITIES TO INCREASE EMPLOYABILITY

Reward or credit after a period of working?

WR- Mtg Notes

→ Studies by Outside Groups,
incl. Foundations

Thurs 7/22
Urban Institute

Fri 7/23
Brown Bag - FIP

Thw 7/15 - 3:30
mtg w/ GOP staff

Thw 7/15 - 5:45 PM
Comm - NEC

Welfare Reform Steering Committee

July 13, 1993 Agenda

Discussion of Post-Transitional Work issues - Wendell
(30 minutes)

Issue Group discussion - group leaders (10 minutes)

Working Paper series - Wendell (15 minutes)

Seminar with key Carter Administration welfare reform staff
- Demetra (5 minutes)

Seminar (brown bag) Series - Wendell (5 minutes)

Communications/political review - Jeremy (25 minutes)

July 29, 1993

To: Welfare Reform Participants
From: Wendell Primus
Subject: Welfare Reform Issue Forum

To help increase our common awareness and understanding of some of the issues surrounding welfare reform, we are planning a series of Monday afternoon issue forums on a variety of topics. The first forum, scheduled for Monday, August 2, will focus on noncustodial fathers. Robert Lerman and Theodora Ooms will present and discuss the findings and policy implications described in their book, Young Unwed Fathers: Changing Roles and Emerging Policies.

This session is scheduled for 4:00-6:00pm (on August 2) in room 503A of the Humphrey Building, 200 Independence Avenue, SW. We invite and encourage participation by any staff involved in the welfare reform effort.

July 26, 1993

TO: WELFARE REFORM WORKING GROUP STAFF CONTACTS

SUBJECT: WELFARE REFORM ISSUE FORUM
MONDAY, AUGUST 2, 4:00-6:00PM

FROM: WENDELL PRIMUS

Please see attached.

ADDRESSEES:

Jeremy Ben-Ami
Susan Bender
Marcy Carlson
Robert Carver
Bonnie Deane
Bernie Delia
Karen Ewing
Mike Fishman
Stacey Grundman
Charlotte Hayes
Jill Khadduri
Cathy Mays
Wendy New
Ben Nye
Francine Obermiller
Carol Roddy
Michele Rodman
Deborah Sorkin
Mildred Taylor
Cookie Walden
Judy Wurtzel



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Secretary

Washington, D.C. 20201

TO: Welfare Reform Issue Group Leaders

FROM: Ann McCormick

SUBJECT: July 22 Meeting for Issue Group Leaders

DATE: July 16, 1993

As you may know, the Working Group liaisons had a planning session this Wednesday, July 14, focusing principally on issues related to transitional welfare and the post-transitional phase. They have scheduled a meeting for all the Issue Group leaders next Thursday, July 22, to provide feedback from the planning session and to discuss the "big picture" as it is currently viewed. Mary Jo will lead the discussion.

To help Mary Jo prepare for the session, please send to her first thing on Monday, copies of your latest options papers or other recent materials prepared by your group. Please also send copies to me to distribute to the other Working Group liaisons.

To prepare yourself for the meeting you should give some thought to the key decisions that must be made by (or for) your group to carry out its charge. Lists of these key decisions, similar to the list of Post-Transitional Work Issues distributed and discussed at the July 13 Steering Committee meeting, will soon be compiled for each Issue Group. Let me know if you need a copy of the Post-Transitional Work list.

The Issue Group leader meeting will take place on Thursday from 9-1 at the Rosslyn Westpark Hotel, which can be reached by either Metro (on the orange and blue lines) or car. Parking is complimentary; however, do not park in any of the Reserved spaces. Call me (at 690-5880) if you need directions to the hotel.

WR-
mtgs

1. → Call Belle re Etzioni
2. Mike Lux re McGlothen
3. ~~Inspection - Alan Terry~~

Welfare Reform Steering Committee

June 22, 1993 Agenda

Issue Group discussion

- group leader reports
- charge for Private Sector Job Development group
- status of Prevention/Intact Families group

Issue Group leaders role in public presentations

- intergovernmental meeting on June 24
- series of meetings with advocacy groups
- circulation of leaders names and numbers

Working Paper - finalize list

Communications update

- hearings
- intergovernmental briefings
- press briefing

Working Group issues

- June 30 presentations by USDA and HUD
- July 7 presentation by DOL
- ED presentation?

Role of States

- Work w/ Welfare
- Waivers
- State flexibility

1. End W or Reform Welfare
2. What do you do for single parents
3. What do you mean time-limited W?

Welfare Reform Steering Committee

June 15, 1993 Agenda

Issue Group discussion

- updates/issues/concerns - group leaders
- questions for Modeling group
- reminder about sharing papers

Issue Group presentations to intergovernmental groups

Working Paper series - Wendell

Working Group issues

- June 23 briefing on characteristics/dynamics
 - issues, who's responsible?
 - schedule preparation meeting
 - suggestion from Ag to include discussion on food stamp characteristics
- June 30 presentations by USDA, HUD and Labor

Final agreement on hearing schedule

July 7 - Labor/NEC

Future Steering Committee discussion of welfare reform lessons learned - with Carter staff - Wendell

Margherita/Downey - FSA

Presentation by MDRC, MPR, Urban, etc. on lessons learned from State welfare reform efforts - for issue group staff - Wendell

Site visit updates - Diann

To Do

U. Adams for Janning

* → 1. Sign up for welfare visit

What's your goal? Reduce caseloads
How bold?
How much \$?
Experimentation/waivers/policy toward states
What kind of time limit?
Housing + Food Stamps?

WR-MHgs

Preliminary Ideas on Family Support and Independence Task Force Week 2

Launching the Task Force

We propose that the formation of the Executive Branch Family Support and Independence Task Force be announced by the President at his first Domestic Policy Council Meeting. If possible, this would be held on the same day as the first NGA Welfare Reform Task Force meeting; if so, the President would also meet with the NGA Task Force members to emphasize the need for close coordination. In addition, he would meet with selected members of Congress (preferably on the Hill, in a group meeting). At the end or beginning of the day, he would visit a welfare or child support enforcement office (one possibility is the one-stop comprehensive child support enforcement process in Prince George's County).

The Task Force and Its Role

The Task Force would be comprised generally of Assistant Secretary level appointees representing the appropriate domestic agencies; they are currently being identified by their departments. The Task Force would report to the Domestic Policy Council which will make final recommendations to the President. The Task Force would meet bi-weekly under the leadership of Bruce Reed, Mary Jo Bane, and David Ellwood. Its role is to develop a plan, with options as appropriate, for consideration by the DPC. The members will identify the issues and set the parameters for work to be conducted by the staff. There will be a core staff dedicated to the effort and assigned by task as well as a group of resource experts identified in each department to be called on as necessary. Assistance from resource experts will be requested through a staff-level contact appointed by each department to assure coordination. The overall effort will be managed by a full-time senior manager housed in HHS.

The charge to the Task Force will be to: Move people off of welfare and out of poverty through increase opportunity and responsibility. The plan will emphasize the need for low-income and disadvantaged people to have real control over their lives, to live in dignity, and to support and nurture their families. It will be based on the welfare reform agenda enunciated by the President which includes at least four elements:

- o Making work pay. People who work should not be poor. They should not have to worry about the cost of medical care. They ought to have access to quality child care.
- o Transforming the child support enforcement system. Both parents have a responsibility to support their children. Our child support enforcement system leaves nearly the entire burden on the custodial parent, who is usually the mother.

- o Providing the education, training, and support services people need to get off and stay off welfare. This includes education and training and other supports.
- o Create a transitional welfare system. When the first three steps are in place, then we can move to a truly transitional system where healthy and employable people move off quickly and where those who can't find jobs are provided with them and expected to support their families.

External Contact

During the initiative, the Task Force will consult informally with members of Congress and their staff, with the NGA Task Force and its staff, and outside interest groups and experts. Staff are currently compiling a list of individuals and groups that should be contacted early to elicit ideas.

There will also be a series of public forums with site visits and focus groups with welfare recipients, employers, and service providers (at a minimum of six sites) held throughout the country to gather information at the local level. NGA will be invited to join in sponsoring the forums. We propose to conduct the visits between the middle of May and the end of June. The effort would be supported by one or two task order contracts to handle logistics and to provide documentation.

Timing

We propose the following timeline for the initiative:

March 17

Identify outside resources: contractors, research institutes, individual consultants, etc. to do analytic pieces that won't be done in-house.

March 17

Complete initial list of individuals and organizations who should get calls, visits or letters from DTE and MJB soliciting their ideas on welfare reform.

As soon as possible

Announce the formation of the Welfare Reform Task Force
Bring task order contractor on board to begin preparations for the public hearings and focus group process.

Immediately after DTE and MJB are on board in the Department

Begin making phone calls, visits, and sending out letters to individuals and groups to solicit ideas on welfare reform.

April 19

Make final decisions on main tasks and mechanisms to get analyses completed.

End of April

Announce public hearings schedule and locations.

May 10

Complete initial drafts of analytic papers, including early data analyses.

May 17 to June 18

Hold Public Hearings/Focus Group sessions and site visits at 6 sites (1 to 2 a week) around the country. For each public hearing and focus group session, the contractor will produce transcripts and a summary of highlights.

June 30

Complete final analytic papers with impact and cost data where possible.

July - August

Get decisions made by the work group and refine cost and impact estimates.

August 20

Get final approval of the plan from Task Force members.

September 3

Submit Welfare Reform plan to the Domestic Policy Council.

(Other tasks may be added)

Tasks/Issue Areas

We propose to begin analytic activity on the following issues:

Making Work Pay

How to Improve the Advance Payment of the EITC
Child Care
Health Care

Child Support Enforcement

State Incentives in the Child Support Program
New Hire Reporting by Employers
Enforcement Techniques
Paternity Establishment
Child Support Assurance
Restructuring the Child Support Program

Education, Training, and Support

Employment, Education, and Training Activities in the
First Two Years
Post Welfare Issues
What We Have Learned from Past Programs and JOBS
Other Support Services

How to keep People off welfare

Transitional Welfare

Transitional Welfare Strategies
Characteristics/Employability of Long-Term Recipients
Monthly Welfare Dynamics
AFDC Improvements

Work - what kinds of jobs, who pays

Broad Policies

Financing Welfare Reform
Linking Federal Policy to States and State Level Policies
Overall Program Design--Interactions
Welfare Simplification and Consistency
Demonstrations, evaluation, and waivers

Performance measures

Outreach and Public Support

Outlines of sub-issues and tasks related to these issues are attached.

Next Steps

During the next week, staff propose to undertake the following activities:

- o Provide more detail on the hearings and needed support
- o Identify more specifically the needed analyses and gaps in information, as well as beginning very preliminary work on the analyses
- o Expanding on additional issues:
 - Federal/state role in reform
 - the role of demonstrations and relationship to state initiatives
 - the minimum wage
 - the overlap and interaction with other initiatives
 - the non-custodial parent
- o Continue with assessment of personnel, contract support



U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Washington, D.C. 20410-5000

May 25, 1993

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
FOR PUBLIC AND INDIAN HOUSING

David T. Ellwood
Assistant Secretary for
Planning and Evaluation-Designate
Department of Health and Human Services
200 Independence Avenue, S.W. - Room 415F
Washington, DC 20201

Dear Mr. Ellwood:

I will not be able to attend the Welfare Reform Task Force meeting June 1, but there are two points I wish to make, therefore, I have taken the liberty of writing to you directly.

The goal of the task force is to make President Clinton's desire, that people should work, and that those who do should not be poor, a reality. However, last meeting focused only on the disincentives for people on welfare to work, or to put it more positively, how to get people off welfare.

This direction is a truly important one, but for public housing and its residents, it almost misses the point. The real key to improving the quality of life in public housing is not getting the single mothers off welfare, but getting the single young men from 17-35 employed. It is their employment that would stabilize the community, make it safer, and potentially put families together again. Further, since they are the fathers, it is critical even to your scheme, that they have income to support their children.

The second point is that we need to develop more jobs. Contrary to popular opinion, these young men want to work. Every time I went to a housing development in Los Angeles, numbers of young men would recognize me and ask for jobs. Also in your scheme, the attempt to place time limitations on public assistance programs requires government to have jobs available.

I apologize for making an already daunting task more difficult, but we would not be doing it right if we did not address the young men and the need to develop more jobs.

Sincerely Yours,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Joseph Shuldiner".

Joseph Shuldiner
Assistant Secretary-Designate

cc: Mary Jo Bane
Bruce Reed
Michael Stegman

MAY 27, 1993

WELFARE REFORM COMMUNICATIONS MEETING

- 0 WELFARE REFORM PROJECT UPDATE
- 0 UPDATES
 - INTERGOVERNMENTAL
 - PUBLIC LIASON
 - LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS
- 0 SUMMER SCHEDULE

DPC 4/10 - P.R.
August events around NGA

How to make news?
→ Assurance deal w/ May 1993?
→ Finalize members
→ Courtesy calls to warn of assurance.

- 1. Members → Endorse Thompson waiver?
- 2. Courtesy calls → MDRC studies? PPI study?
- 3. Packet → EITC event?
- 4. Talking Pts. for BC → Meet w/ GOPs
- 5. Brief members

Site Visits

N.J.
Wisc?/Chicago
Ky./La.
So. Calif.
Ohio
CT.

File:
WR ~~Working Group~~
- Mtgs.

MEMORANDUM FOR MEMBERS OF THE WORKING GROUP ON WELFARE REFORM,
FAMILY SUPPORT AND INDEPENDENCE

FROM: BRUCE REED
DAVID T. ELLWOOD
MARY JO BANE
WORKING GROUP CO-CHAIRS

SUBJECT: June, 1993 Meetings of the Working Group

The Working Group on Welfare Reform, Family Support and Independence will meet on Wednesday, June 2 1993, at 4:00 p.m. in Room 324 of the Old Executive Office Building. The Working Group is also scheduled to meet on June 9, June 16, June 23, and June 30, again at 4:00 in Room 324. Background briefings on the basic elements of the welfare reform agenda will be the primary topics of discussion. A tentative schedule of the briefing topics is attached.

Please contact Cathy Mays at 456-6515 by 12:00 on the day of each meeting and advise her who will be attending from your organization.

We look forward to your continuing interest and participation as we carry out the President's welfare reform agenda.

Attachment

Working Group on Welfare Reform, Family Support and Independence

June 1993

- June 2 Discussion of Principles
 Child Support Issues
- June 9 Child Support Issues (conclusion), including
 Child Support Insurance/Assurance
 Absent Parents
- June 16 Discussion of the "Time Limit"
 Transitional Assistance
 Post-Transitional Work
- June 23 Education, Training and Other Services
- June 30 Interagency Services:
 - HUD presentation on housing benefits
 - USDA presentation on food stamps
 - DOL presentation on training and
 work support programs

May 17, 1993

Welfare Reform Meetings - by type

Other Departments

Treasury - Economic Policy and Tax Policy - completed
Labor - Deputy Secretary - completed
Education - Rodney McCowan - completed
follow-up meeting to be scheduled
HUD - Michael Stegman - to be scheduled
Agriculture - Ellen Haas - Friday, May 21 - 1:30-2:30
Treasury - IRS - to be scheduled

Work Group Feedback Sessions

Making Work Pay - completed
Child Care - completed
Other Support Services - completed
Child Support - deferred to Issue Group follow-up
Absent Parents - completed
Transitional Assistance - completed
Education and Training - completed
Post-Transitional Work - Monday, May 24 - 3:30-5:00
Modeling - to be scheduled
AFDC Simplification - completed

Issue Group Brainstorming/Kick-off

Disability - Wednesday, May 19 - 4:00-5:00

Issue Group Follow-up Sessions

Make Work Pay - completed (with Other Support Services)
Support Services - Thursday, June 3 - 9:30-11
Child Support - Thursday, May 27 - 9:30-11
Absent Parents - Thursday, May 27 - 3-4:30
Transitional Assistance (with Education and Training issue group) - Monday, May 17 - 11-12:30
Education and Training (with Transitional Assistance issue group) - Monday, May 24 - 11-12:30
Post-Transitional Work - to be scheduled
Modeling - to be scheduled
AFDC Simplification - Friday, May 28 - 2-3:30